

shall make reasonable efforts to obtain information concerning:

- (a) The customer's financial status;
- (b) The customer's tax status;
- (c) The customer's investment objectives; and
- (d) Such other information used or considered to be reasonable by such bank in making recommendations to the customer.

§ 368.100 Obligations concerning institutional customers.

(a) As a result of broadened authority provided by the Government Securities Act Amendments of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 78o–3 and 78o–5), the FDIC is adopting sales practice rules for the government securities market, a market with a particularly broad institutional component. Accordingly, the FDIC believes it is appropriate to provide further guidance to banks on their suitability obligations when making recommendations to institutional customers.

(b) The FDIC's suitability rule (§368.4) is fundamental to fair dealing and is intended to promote ethical sales practices and high standards of professional conduct. Banks' responsibilities include having a reasonable basis for recommending a particular security or strategy, as well as having reasonable grounds for believing the recommendation is suitable for the customer to whom it is made. Banks are expected to meet the same high standards of competence, professionalism, and good faith regardless of the financial circumstances of the customer.

(c) In recommending to a customer the purchase, sale, or exchange of any government security, the bank shall have reasonable grounds for believing that the recommendation is suitable for the customer upon the basis of the facts, if any, disclosed by the customer as to the customer's other security holdings and financial situation and needs.

(d) The interpretation in this section concerns only the manner in which a bank determines that a recommendation is suitable for a particular institutional customer. The manner in which a bank fulfills this suitability obligation will vary, depending on the nature of the customer and the specific trans-

action. Accordingly, the interpretation in this section deals only with guidance regarding how a bank may fulfill customer-specific suitability obligations under §368.4.¹

(e) While it is difficult to define in advance the scope of a bank's suitability obligation with respect to a specific institutional customer transaction recommended by a bank, the FDIC has identified certain factors that may be relevant when considering compliance with §368.4. These factors are not intended to be requirements or the only factors to be considered but are offered merely as guidance in determining the scope of a bank's suitability obligations.

(f) The two most important considerations in determining the scope of a bank's suitability obligations in making recommendations to an institutional customer are the customer's capability to evaluate investment risk independently and the extent to which the customer is exercising independent judgement in evaluating a bank's recommendation. A bank must determine, based on the information available to it, the customer's capability to evaluate investment risk. In some cases, the bank may conclude that the customer is not capable of making independent investment decisions in general. In other cases, the institutional customer may have general capability, but may not be able to understand a particular type of instrument or its risk. This is more likely to arise with relatively new types of instruments, or those with significantly different risk or volatility characteristics than other investments generally made by the institution. If a customer is either generally not capable of evaluating investment risk or lacks sufficient capability to evaluate the particular product, the scope of a bank's customer-specific obligations under §368.4 would not be diminished by the fact that the bank was

¹The interpretation in this section does not address the obligation related to suitability that requires that a bank have " * * * a 'reasonable basis' to believe that the recommendation could be suitable for at least some customers." *In the Matter of the Application of F.J. Kaufman and Company of Virginia and Frederick J. Kaufman, Jr.*, 50 SEC 164 (1989).

dealing with an institutional customer. On the other hand, the fact that a customer initially needed help understanding a potential investment need not necessarily imply that the customer did not ultimately develop an understanding and make an independent investment decision.

(g) A bank may conclude that a customer is exercising independent judgment if the customer's investment decision will be based on its own independent assessment of the opportunities and risks presented by a potential investment, market factors and other investment considerations. Where the bank has reasonable grounds for concluding that the institutional customer is making independent investment decisions and is capable of independently evaluating investment risk, then a bank's obligations under § 368.4 for a particular customer are fulfilled.² Where a customer has delegated decision-making authority to an agent, such as an investment advisor or a bank trust department, the interpretation in this section shall be applied to the agent.

(h) A determination of capability to evaluate investment risk independently will depend on an examination of the customer's capability to make its own investment decisions, including the resources available to the customer to make informed decisions. Relevant considerations could include:

(1) The use of one or more consultants, investment advisers, or bank trust departments;

(2) The general level of experience of the institutional customer in financial markets and specific experience with the type of instruments under consideration;

(3) The customer's ability to understand the economic features of the security involved;

(4) The customer's ability to independently evaluate how market developments would affect the security; and

(5) The complexity of the security or securities involved.

(i) A determination that a customer is making independent investment decisions will depend on the nature of the

relationship that exists between the bank and the customer. Relevant considerations could include:

(1) Any written or oral understanding that exists between the bank and the customer regarding the nature of the relationship between the bank and the customer and the services to be rendered by the bank;

(2) The presence or absence of a pattern of acceptance of the bank's recommendations;

(3) The use by the customer of ideas, suggestions, market views and information obtained from other government securities brokers or dealers or market professionals, particularly those relating to the same type of securities; and

(4) The extent to which the bank has received from the customer current comprehensive portfolio information in connection with discussing recommended transactions or has not been provided important information regarding its portfolio or investment objectives.

(j) Banks are reminded that these factors are merely guidelines that will be utilized to determine whether a bank has fulfilled its suitability obligation with respect to a specific institutional customer transaction and that the inclusion or absence of any of these factors is not dispositive of the determination of suitability. Such a determination can only be made on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances of a particular bank/customer relationship, assessed in the context of a particular transaction.

(k) For purposes of the interpretation in this section, an institutional customer shall be any entity other than a natural person. In determining the applicability of the interpretation in this section to an institutional customer, the FDIC will consider the dollar value of the securities that the institutional customer has in its portfolio and/or under management. While the interpretation in this section is potentially applicable to any institutional customer, the guidance contained in this section is more appropriately applied to an institutional customer with at least \$10

²See footnote 1 in paragraph (d) of this section.

million invested in securities in the aggregate in its portfolio and/or under management.

PART 369—PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF INTERSTATE BRANCHES PRIMARILY FOR DEPOSIT PRODUCTION

Sec.

369.1 Purpose and scope.

369.2 Definitions.

369.3 Loan-to-deposit ratio screen.

369.4 Credit needs determination.

369.5 Sanctions.

AUTHORITY: 12 U.S.C. 1819 (Tenth) and 1835a.

SOURCE: 62 FR 47737, Sept. 10, 1997, unless otherwise noted.

§ 369.1 Purpose and scope.

(a) *Purpose.* The purpose of this part is to implement section 109 (12 U.S.C. 1835a) of the Riegle-Neal Interstate Banking and Branching Efficiency Act of 1994 (Interstate Act).

(b) *Scope.* (1) This part applies to any State nonmember bank that has operated a covered interstate branch for a period of at least one year.

(2) This part describes the requirements imposed under 12 U.S.C. 1835a, which requires the appropriate Federal banking agencies (the FDIC, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System) to prescribe uniform rules that prohibit a bank from using any authority to engage in interstate branching pursuant to the Interstate Act, or any amendment made by the Interstate Act to any other provision of law, primarily for the purpose of deposit production.

§ 369.2 Definitions.

For purposes of this part, the following definitions apply:

(a) *Bank* means, unless the context indicates otherwise:

(1) A State nonmember bank; and

(2) A foreign bank as that term is defined in 12 U.S.C. 3101(7) and 12 CFR 346.1(a).

(b) *Covered interstate branch* means:

(1) Any branch of a State nonmember bank, and any insured branch of a foreign bank licensed by a State, that:

(i) Is established or acquired outside the bank's home State pursuant to the interstate branching authority granted by the Interstate Act or by any amendment made by the Interstate Act to any other provision of law; or

(ii) Could not have been established or acquired outside of the bank's home State but for the establishment or acquisition of a branch described in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section; and

(2) Any bank or branch of a bank controlled by an out-of-State bank holding company.

(c) *Home State* means:

(1) With respect to a State bank, the State that chartered the bank;

(2) With respect to a national bank, the State in which the main office of the bank is located;

(3) With respect to a bank holding company, the State in which the total deposits of all banking subsidiaries of such company are the largest on the later of:

(i) July 1, 1966; or

(ii) The date on which the company becomes a bank holding company under the Bank Holding Company Act;

(4) With respect to a foreign bank:

(i) For purposes of determining whether a U.S. branch of a foreign bank is a covered interstate branch, the home State of the foreign bank as determined in accordance with 12 U.S.C. 3103(c) and 12 CFR 347.202(j); and

(ii) For purposes of determining whether a branch of a U.S. bank controlled by a foreign bank is a covered interstate branch, the State in which the total deposits of all banking subsidiaries of such foreign bank are the largest on the later of:

(A) July 1, 1966; or

(B) The date on which the foreign bank becomes a bank holding company under the Bank Holding Company Act.

(d) *Host State* means a State in which a covered interstate branch is established or acquired.

(e) *Host state loan-to-deposit ratio* generally means, with respect to a particular host state, the ratio of total loans in the host state relative to total deposits from the host state for all banks (including institutions covered under the definition of "bank" in 12 U.S.C. 1813(a)(1)) that have that state as their home state, as determined and